DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 460 EA 027 755

TITLE	Goals 2000: Increasing Student Achievement through State and Local Initiatives.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 Apr 96
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Accountability; Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; Federal State Relationship; *State Action; State Programs; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Goals 2000

ABSTRACT

This document is the U.S. Department of Education's first report to Congress on the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. It includes a brief history of the 1994 law, a description of how states and school districts are using their Goals 2000 money, a look at how the program is helping to reshape the department's technical-assistance effort, and a state-by-state chart of allocations. Appendices contain lists of completed state education-improvement plans, urban and rural reform grants, and amendments to Goals 2000. Parental assistance centers are also described and listed. (Contains 17 endnotes.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 460

Goals 2000: Increasing Student Achievement Through State and Local Initiatives

April 30, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NOTE: On April 26, 1996 President Clinton signed the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act which included several amendments to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. A description of these amendments can be found in Appendix E of this report.

Goals 2000: The U.S. Department of Education's first report to Congress on the Goals 2000: Educate America Act is now available.

The 34-page report includes a brief history of the 1994 law, a description of how states and school districts are using their Goals 2000 money, a look at how the program is helping reshape the department's technical-assistance effort, and a state-by-state chart of allocations.

"Goals 2000: Increasing Student Initiative Through State and Local Initiatives," free from the Education Department at (800) USA-LEARN. It is also on the World Wide Web at http://www.ed.gov/G2K/GoalsRpt/.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

- Goals 2000: Building on a Decade of Reform 1
- The 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit 2
- A Grounding in State Experience 4

State Leadership for Local Improvement 6

- Building State Partnerships To Improve Education 7
- Developing Challenging Academic Standards 8
- Developing Assessments of Students Learning 11
- Strengthening School Accountability 12

Local Improvements in Teaching and Learning 13

- Building New Local Partnerships 14
- Upgrading Teacher Preparation Assessments, Curriculum, & Instruction 15
- Getting Educational Technology Into Schools 18

Flexibility For Improvement: A Better Federal Partnership With States and Communities 20

- A Better Way of Doing Business 20
- A New Approach To Program Management 21
- Increasing Flexibility Through Waivers 21
- Maximizing Flexibility Through the Ed-Flex Demonstration Program 23

Conclusion 24

Endnotes 26
Appendix A Goals 2000 Funding Allocations 28
Appendix B Completed State Improvement Plans 29
Appendix C Urban and Rural Reform Grants 30
Appendix D Parental Assistance Centers 31
Appendix E Amendments to Goals 2000 33

INTRODUCTION

Congress and President Clinton made a bi-partisan commitment to education on March 31, 1994, when the Goals 2000: Educate America Act was signed into law. Although education is and must remain a local function and a state responsibility, the federal government pledged to form a new and supportive partnership with states and communities in an effort to improve student academic achievement across the nation.

Educators, business and parent organizations, and Republican and Democratic elected leaders agreed that this national response was needed. Despite more than a decade of education reforms, students and schools are not measuring up to the high standards required to maintain a competitive economy and a strong democracy.

At the heart of the Goals 2000 Act is a grants program designed to help states and communities develop and implement their own education reforms focused on raising student achievement. States participating in Goals 2000 are asked to raise expectations for students by setting challenging academic standards. Each state is to develop comprehensive strategies for helping all students reach those standards -- by upgrading assessments and curriculum to reflect the standards, improving the quality of teaching, expanding the use of technology, strengthening accountability for teaching and learning, promoting more flexibility and choice within the public school system, and building strong partnerships among schools and families, employers, and others in the community. Finally, each state is asked to develop its improvement strategies with broad-based, grassroots involvement.

States that participate in Goals 2000 receive seed money to help launch and sustain their ongoing education reform efforts. States are also given unprecedented flexibility through Goals 2000. No new regulations have been issued to implement the program, and states and local school districts can use Goals 2000 funds for a wide range of activities that fit within their own approaches to helping students reach higher standards. In addition, Goals 2000 expands flexibility in other federal education programs by providing the U.S. Secretary of Education and some states with the authority to waive many federal rules and regulations if they interfere with local or state education reform strategies.

Goals 2000: Building on a Decade of Reform

Goals 2000 is a direct outgrowth of the state-led education reform movement of the 1980s. By the mid- to late- 1980s a number of states had put in place a series of steps to improve education. Frequently, the state education reforms included increasing high school graduation requirements, particularly in math and science, instituting statewide testing programs, offering more Advanced Placement courses, promoting the use of technology in the classroom, and instituting new teacher evaluation programs.

These education reforms yielded important results. On a number of important indicators, academic performance has increased and the gap between white and minority students has decreased.

- Course taking patterns of high school students have shown important improvements. From 1982 to 1994, the percentage of high school students taking the challenging academic courses recommended in the 1983 *A Nation at Risk* report increased from 14 to 52 percent.[1] Enrollments in Advanced Placement (AP) courses have also increased significantly, and the number of students passing AP exams nearly tripled between 1982 and 1995.[2]

- The average performance in mathematics improved substantially on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) between 1978 and 1992.[3] Among 9- and 13- year olds, the improvement was the equivalent of at least one grade level. Performance in science was also higher in 1992 than in 1978 among all age groups, especially in general science knowledge and skills. At the same time, the gap in performance between white and minority students has been narrowing, especially in mathematics.

- Scores on SAT tests have also shown increases at the same time that the number of high school students taking the tests has increased.[4] The combined verbal and math score on the SAT has increased 17 points from 1982 to 1995. During this period, minority students as a percentage of all test-takers increased from 18 to 31 percent. Both verbal and math SAT scores increased significantly for students from virtually all racial and ethnic groups from 1982 to 1995.

While these gains in academic performance are significant, they have not been sufficient. The math and science gains were generally not matched in reading performance, where NAEP results remain relatively unchanged. And while the gap in performance between white and minority students narrowed, it remains unacceptably large.

Further, it is increasingly important to judge educational performance against the performance of students in other countries, rather than against past performance in the U.S. Because of international economic competition, states have learned that they are competing with other countries, rather than other states, to attract and retain high paying jobs. The knowledge and skill levels of the state's workforce is one important resource for attracting employers. By the mid-1980s a series of studies demonstrated that the performance of U.S. students lagged significantly behind those of other countries. By this standard, the need for education reform was as urgent at the end of the 1980s as it was at the beginning.

The 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit

The 1989 Education Summit convened by President Bush and the Nation's governors, led by then-Governor Bill Clinton, further underscored the need for a national response to address educational needs. The Charlottesville Summit led to a number of commitments and developments, each important for sustaining the momentum of education reform. These include:

- The creation of the National Education Goals which provide a national framework, but give states and communities flexibility to design their own strategies to achieve them.

- A clear recognition that state education improvement efforts need to focus on raising the achievement levels of all students, in all schools -- rather than simply creating models of excellence and innovation.

- A broad consensus among state leaders, business leaders, parents and the education community regarding the overall direction education reform needs to take. This consensus centers on raising academic standards; measuring student and school performance against those standards; providing schools and educators with the tools, skills, and resources needed to prepare students to reach the standards; and holding schools accountable for the results.

- A clear statement of an important and carefully defined federal role in improving education. While reaffirming that education is and must remain a state responsibility and a local function, the governors and President Bush also agreed in Charlottesville that states need assistance from the federal government in order to succeed. More specifically, they agreed that the federal government: (1) must maintain its financial role in education, especially with regard to providing disadvantaged students and students with disabilities access to education at all levels; (2) must support state-led education reforms, through research and development, data gathering, and assistance to help spread effective practices; and (3) must administer federal education programs with greater flexibility and in a fashion that supports state leadership of education reform.

The National Education Goals

By the Year 2000:

- All children in America will start school ready to learn.
- The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
- All students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter in the core academic subjects.
- U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
- Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
- Every school in the U.S. will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
- The Nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.
- Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.

The Goals 2000 Act reflects these commitments. The Act endorses the national education goals that provide voluntary direction for education improvement efforts. It provides a broad framework for education reform, built on the direction to which states and local communities were already committed, and is easily adaptable to the unique circumstances in each state and community. Goals 2000 provides support to state and local education reforms with exactly the kind of flexibility called for at the Charlottesville Education Summit.

A Grounding in State Experience

To fully appreciate the approach embodied in Goals 2000, it helps to examine a pair of states that launched similar efforts prior to the enactment of the Act. In both Maryland and Kentucky -- after six years of sustained effort and commitment to high standards -- students are showing achievement gains.

In 1990, the **Kentucky** State Legislature passed the comprehensive Kentucky Education Reform Act. A central feature of the Act is high academic standards for all students: each strategy is tied to achieving high standards so that all activities complement and reinforce one another. For example, a curriculum framework provides schools with the tools to develop a curriculum based on the state's high standards, as well as assessments to measure student progress.

New state assessments tied to high standards have been in place since 1992. Every year, schools are held accountable for student learning through a school performance reporting system that includes rewards for outstanding schools and interventions for low-performing ones -- ranging from technical assistance to state takeover. At the same time, schools have been given greater autonomy and authority to manage themselves through school-based decision-making councils that include teachers, parents and community members.

A new financing system brought greater equity across districts. Teachers now get more training to teach to high standards, and schools have better access to educational technology in their classrooms. Also, more students enter school ready to learn due to expanded preschool programs, family resource centers, and extended school services for those who need additional support to achieve high standards. Kentucky has targeted its Goals 2000 funds toward accelerating local reforms, with a particular emphasis on strengthening parent involvement in schools.

Comprehensive reform is beginning to pay off in Kentucky. Students are showing gains in academic achievement. The state's 4th, 8th, and 12th graders made substantial improvement on the 1993-94 state assessment and continued improvement on the 1994-95 assessment, with the most dramatic gains experienced by 4th graders.[5] In all grades, the percentage of students performing at the proficient/distinguished level in mathematics, reading, science, and social studies increased over time. In grade 4 the average of the scores across all subjects tested rose from 24 points in 1993 to 38 points in 1995, on a scale of 0 to 140. In reading, the percentage of 4th graders scoring at the proficient/distinguished level increased from 8 percent in 1993 to 30 percent in 1995.

Similarly, **Maryland** launched a comprehensive reform effort -- Schools for Success -- after the Charlottesville Education Summit in 1989. The cornerstone of Maryland's reform effort is its accountability system that establishes high standards for student achievement and related statewide assessments of student progress toward meeting the high standards. More than 3,000 teachers have been involved in designing and scoring test items for grades 3, 5, and 8 as part of the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP). Every year the state reports school progress along such indicators as student achievement in relation to the state's standards and school attendance and dropout rates. Low-performing schools receive

such interventions as training, consultations and grants, and, if performance does not improve, can ultimately face reconstitution which may involve changing a school's administration, staff, organization, and/or instructional program.

The state has also developed curricular frameworks in subject areas that are designed to assist administrators and teachers in planning, developing, and implementing local curricula and assessments that support the achievement of state standards. Schools are forming School Improvement Teams -- comprising the principal, school staff, parents, and business and community members -- that develop and implement school improvement plans with objectives, strategies, and activities to achieve the state standards.

Maryland chose to use Goals 2000 to comprehensively review and refine its Schools for Success initiative. A 54-member statewide planning panel -- co-chaired by a local educator and a business partner -- reviewed current school reform activities and developed strategies to fill in gaps. In particular, Goals 2000 funds are being used for local improvement initiatives, to increase public involvement in education, accelerate the development of a high school performance assessment, and develop strategies to improve educational technology throughout schools.

Maryland reforms are also showing positive results. In comparison with 1994 state assessment results, in 1995, 52 percent more schools met or approached the standards for satisfactory performance at the third grade level.[6] The number of schools similarly improving has increased by 13 percent at the 5th grade level and by 32 percent at the 8th grade. Students have also made gains: 40 percent of all students statewide met the state standards -- a 25 percent gain over 1993.

Both Maryland and Kentucky are examples of the depth of activity and long-term commitment to standards that are required to raise student achievement. Both states set high targets for performance, measure progress, and continually refine their strategies. They still have a long way to go -- but their gains are mounting and demonstrate to other states and communities the value of sustained effort.

The rest of this report demonstrates the efforts that states and communities are making to improve education. Federal funds are serving as catalysts and supports, but the real leadership is in states and communities that are forging new partnerships to design and implement the school changes that will bring students into the 21st century.

STATE LEADERSHIP FOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENT

I can say directly that the current partnership between federal, state and local educational institutions gives me hope for major progress. A new balance is being forged with the focus on local communities and the other levels in support roles. It is the right balance. It recognizes that no single level can succeed alone in providing the services needed for America's students. Partnerships are the model for a successful future.

-- Bill Randall, Commissioner of Education in Colorado[7]

Although Goals 2000 has only been in effect a short time, the program has changed the face of education as we know it. I applaud your efforts to help children everywhere reach the high academic standards we have set for them.

-- Tommy G. Thompson, Governor of Wisconsin[8]

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act provides seed money to schools, districts, and states to improve education for every child. Simply put, it is used to raise academic standards, to design ways to measure student performance and hold schools accountable, and to help improve teaching and learning in ways that reflect the needs of each state, community, or school. There are many ways to help every child reach challenging academic standards, and Goals 2000 provides resources and flexibility to support a wide range of strategies.

While the bulk of Goals 2000 funding is provided to schools and school districts, states have a critical role of leadership and support for effective local innovations. States are defining clear academic standards that challenge every student, developing assessments to measure student learning, and strengthening school accountability. All of this work is accomplished by involving citizens across each state and by maximizing flexibility for local districts to design strategies that best meet the needs of their students. Some key facts regarding state participation so far:

- Forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and all of the outlying areas received funds in the first year of Goals 2000; primarily for designing or updating their education improvement strategies. (See Appendix A for state allocation amounts.)

- Forty states, DC, Puerto Rico, the BIA, and all of the outlying areas but Guam have received second-year funds, and most of the other states are expected to apply for second-year money before the June 30th deadline.

- Twenty states and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have submitted comprehensive improvement plans for review. (See Appendix B.)

- The law requires each state to distribute at least 60 percent of first-year funds to local school districts. Some states awarded more than 60 percent. For instance, Utah devoted more than 90 percent of its first-year funds to local activities, Connecticut more than 86 percent, and Arizona gave 80 percent of its first-year funds to districts.

- By statute at least 90 percent of second-year Goals 2000 state grants will go to local school districts and schools.

Building State Partnerships To Improve Education

At the state level, Goals 2000 planning activities have created and strengthened partnerships and support for learning. Over the past two years, governors and chief state school officers have together assembled broad-based planning panels representing viewpoints from across their states -- including state and local policymakers, educators, business, parents, and community members. These panels assess the current state of education, and design a plan for raising student achievement. Many states that already had commissions or task forces in place used them for the Goals 2000 planning process. In addition, states that already had comprehensive reform plans could utilize them to meet the Goals 2000 planning requirements.

State planning panels vary in size, but each is representative of the state, and each reaches out to even greater numbers of citizens. Numerous town meetings, public hearings, written feedback, and partnerships have helped shape state improvement plans. In turn, the plans include strategies for increasing public involvement in education.

In New Mexico the Goals 2000 planning process was a catalyst for bringing together many participants in the education system. During Goals 2000 planning, the state panel learned about local projects sponsored by organizations such as the Panasonic Foundation, the Education Commission of the States, the Carnegie Foundation, and the National Science Foundation. They brought these project leaders together for the first time, enabling them to begin to collaborate, reduce duplicative efforts, and leverage small grants to have a larger impact.

As intended, states have built their plans on their own goals and strategies. Thus, you will not see the title "Goals 2000" in every state. Instead you will see such state-driven initiatives as "New Directions for Education" in Delaware, "Academics 2000" in Texas, the "Green Mountain Challenge" in Vermont, or "Education for the 21st Century" in Oregon. Each state also tailors its use of Goals 2000 funds. For example, Texas' plan supports its newly revised state education code, and its Goals 2000 grants to schools focus on improving reading in early grades. Oregon is focused on helping districts implement school improvement strategies to help all students reach the standards incorporated in the state's Certificates of Initial Mastery and Advanced Mastery. And several states -- such as Massachusetts, Minnesota, Michigan, and Arizona -- have used Goals 2000 funds to support public charter schools, as an integral part of their overall school reform efforts.

Vermont's Green Mountain Challenge[9]

Goals 2000 builds on the comprehensive reform effort – the Green Mountain Challenge – that Vermont launched in 1991. Vermont's challenge is simply stated: high skills for every student, no exceptions, no excuses. Recognizing that such a vision would require dramatic changes, the state has actively engaged citizens throughout Vermont in school improvement.

The Green Mountain Challenge calls for the development of world-class academic standards, comprehensive assessments, and an education system that provides every student an opportunity to meet the standards. In 1993 Vermont adopted a *Common Core of Learning* that describes 20 "vital results" (learning goals), after more than 4,000 Vermonters actively provided input. Work is under way to develop a framework for curriculum and assessment that includes concrete standards of performance as well as suggested types of learning experiences. Local districts will determine how best to reach the state standards. Vermont also has an annual school report night when the community is invited into schools for a discussion of student performance.

Goals 2000 has afforded Vermont an opportunity to review, assess, and improve its reform activity to date. The state has used Goals 2000 to target three areas of weakness in its education system: dropout prevention, accountability, and local reform activity. The state designed a comprehensive prevention program to reduce its dropout rate. It also developed a Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities, which consists of indicators to measure educational progress at the school, district, and state levels. Now a report is available that compares all schools in Vermont on 24 indicators. Local Goals 2000 grants have focused on developing and implementing school plans that support the achievement of high standards by all students and address weak school indicators.

Developing Challenging Academic Standards

Students and schools respond to the expectations we have for them. Educators have learned a lesson from business and industry: a key to success is defining clear, high standards of performance and a system that measures results in relation to those standards. Therefore the development of challenging academic standards is the linchpin of local and state improvement activities under Goals 2000. Once developed, academic standards provide a target for students, teachers and parents. Similarly, they provide a focal point for rigorous assessments, better curriculum and instruction, improved teacher training, and accountability.

The call in Goals 2000 for high academic standards is not new. It reinforces and encourages the acceleration of state and local efforts that began in some states and communities well before the passage of this Act. Momentum behind implementing high academic standards and related assessments is mounting. A 1995 *Phi Delta Kappan* poll indicated that 87 percent of the public supports higher standards in core academic subjects.[10] The call for raising expectations was heard again at the 1996 National Education Summit that brought together the nation's governors and business leaders.

"Our youth will continue to pay the price if we fail to articulate clear expectations for knowledge and competence. Young people with high school diplomas may think that they have a passport to the future, but too few are qualified for employment against the high standards required in the global economy. The stark reality is that youth who cannot perform against high workplace expectations are not going to be employed."
-- Business Coalition for Education Reform
May 10, 1995 letter to Congressman Goodling

What Is a Standard?[11]

Academic standards describe what every student should know and be able to do in core academic content areas (e.g. mathematics, science, geography). They also define how students demonstrate their skills and knowledge.

An Example of Math Standards in Massachusetts[12]

Students in Massachusetts must master several areas of mathematics. In grades 5 through 8, the Number and Number Relationships Learning Standards ask students to engage in problem solving, communicating, reasoning, and connecting to:

- represent and use equivalent forms of numbers, including integers, fractions, decimals, percents, exponents, and scientific notation;
- apply ratios, proportions, and percents;
- investigate and describe the relationships among fractions, decimals, and percents; and
- represent numerical relationships in one- and two-dimensional graphs.

Examples of student learning include:

- Students use a spreadsheet to work with ratios as they consider cooking recipes for small and large groups.
- Students solve a mathematical problem such as: As part of yearly fundraiser, student volunteers are selling pizzas. Six-inch individual cheese pizzas were $2.75 last year and will be the same this year. What is a fair price to ask for their new 12-inch family cheese pizza? Students justify their answers.
- Students go to a supermarket to record prices of different size containers of identical products. Later their data are used to determine the best buy. As students justify their reasoning, using ratios and comparisons, factors such as food spoilage and storage are also considered.

Goals 2000 honors the variety of approaches to developing and implementing challenging standards that satisfy different state and community needs. For instance, some states are developing a single set of state standards for all districts and schools while others are developing model state standards against which locally developed standards will be measured and approved. Goals 2000 does not specify a particular approach, but instead focuses on creating a common expectation for all students to reach challenging academic standards.

- **Delaware** is implementing high standards statewide as the centerpiece of New Directions for Education, a statewide improvement initiative launched in 1992. Curriculum framework commissions spent three years developing internationally competitive standards in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies with four benchmark points -- grades K-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-10. The state has targeted more than $940,000 of its Goals 2000 funds to enable schools to design and pilot-test their own curriculum geared to achieving the new state academic standards.

- **Colorado** has a strong history of local control over education decisions, so the state legislature passed legislation in 1993 that called for the development of model state standards while giving districts flexibility to develop their own standards that "meet or exceed" the state model. The state established a Standards and Assessment Development and Implementation Council that spent two years developing a model set

of state content standards with the input of 14,000 citizens throughout Colorado. Schools and districts are now in the process of developing or revising their own standards -- often with the assistance of Goals 2000 funds -- to ensure that they meet or exceed the state's standards.

- **Texas** has long had a set of "essential knowledge and skills" that includes broad state goals for student learning. The state is currently using about $2.1 million in Goals 2000 funds to evaluate and revise the state's standards, making them more relevant to the knowledge and skills students will need to be successful in the 21st century. Essential Knowledge and Skills Clarification Teams, comprising 325 individuals from across Texas, have been established in each academic subject area to review and revise the state's standards to ensure that they are rigorous and focus on the knowledge and skills that students should demonstrate.

- **Nevada's** comprehensive improvement plan, Nevada 2000, outlines key strategies, benchmarks, and timelines for developing challenging standards in each of the state's core academic subjects. As a result of its Goals 2000 planning process, the state has established a Teaching and Learning, Standards, and Assessments Advisory Team that includes educators, parents, legislators, business and industry representatives, and community members to evaluate and revise Nevada's Course of Study to include challenging standards for student performance in each subject area by 1999.

Developing Local Standards In Windsor, Colorado

As part of its reform plan, which is heavily focused on local district activity, Colorado awarded a $21,238 Goals 2000 grant to Windsor to develop standards and assessments with maximum community involvement so that teachers, administrators, parents, and community members would understand and be able to implement new academic standards.

All of the district's staff and 100 community members (of this town of 6,000) participated in developing final academic standards in language arts, math, science, and social studies. More than half of the staff helped create assessments of writing tied to standards.

According to the district, "From the start, we knew that we wanted our local standards to come not only from the teachers, but from parents and community members themselves. ... Our approach required more trust on the part of district staff and more responsible dedication on the part of parent volunteers."

In order to ensure that parents and community members were as involved in the development of academic standards as educators, the community created a standards development committee made up of parents and community representatives who worked independently to develop a set of priorities for academic standards. Teachers were then able to draw upon the work of parents and community members throughout their entire standards development and implementation process.

States and school districts are assisted in their standards-setting work by models from other states, by voluntary national models in various subject areas, and by other federal grants to develop challenging standards. For example, Colorado, Massachusetts and Delaware are currently benchmarking their standards against each other -- as part of the independent New Standards project -- to ensure that they are challenging for all students. Goals 2000 encourages and supports such multi-state collaboration.

Developing Assessments of Student Learning

The flexibility that Goals 2000 provides for schools, districts, and states to design ways to help all students reach high standards is coupled with responsibility for showing student learning results. Measuring student achievement against challenging standards is a critical part of continuously improving instruction and holding schools accountable. Goals 2000 provides support for the development of good assessments of student performance that can provide key information to students, teachers, parents, school and state administrators, policymakers, and the general public regarding the level of student learning and effectiveness of schools.

With few exceptions, current testing programs are not yet designed to reflect state academic content standards, nor do they measure the kinds of rigorous learning experiences that students should have in school. Districts and states need better forms of assessment that are linked to what students are expected to know and be able to do. While 43 states used some sort of statewide assessment program in 1994-95, most have not developed or adopted assessments that are connected to their tougher standards. One of the reasons most often cited by states is that the cost of developing these better forms of assessments is high.

States have used the Goals 2000 planning process to further their assessment development activity, but most of the Goals 2000 grant money goes directly from states to school districts for local activities. One way the U.S. Department of Education supports the development of state assessments is through a discretionary grant program that was funded with first-year Goals 2000 national leadership monies. In the Fall of 1995, Goals 2000 leadership money was used to provide assessment development grants to a small number of states, as authorized under Section 220 of the Act. Applications for this competitive program were received from 40 states -- either individually or as part of a consortium. The Department made nine awards -- to eight individual states and a consortium of 22 states. The funded projects range from developing statewide English/language arts assessments to developing tests for high school graduation. Although the impact of such recent awards cannot yet be assessed, many of the projects focus on an area of particular difficulty for districts and states: designing testing accommodations that allow limited English proficient students and students with disabilities to be assessed against the same standards as all students. For example:

ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Delaware	201,785
Maryland	224,707
Michigan	257,228
Minnesota	253,257
North Carolina	80,267
North Dakota	223,039
Oregon	322,019
Pennsylvania	181,014
State Consortium*	242,684
TOTAL	$1,986,000

* This consortium of 22 states is managed by the Council of Chief State School Officers

- **Delaware** is using Goals 2000 funds to design assessments for special education students. The state is currently developing the Inclusive Comprehensive Assessment System to measure how well all students are meeting the state content standards in

language arts, mathematics, social science, and science. Delaware's assessment development grant will help the state design, develop, and evaluate assessments to best meet the needs of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency, in mathematics at grades 3 and 8, and in science in grades 5 and 10.

- **Minnesota** is currently developing a rigorous set of graduation standards for high school students. The state is using its assessment development grant to modify new assessments so that all students, including those with disabilities and limited English proficiency, can participate in the state's assessments and graduation standards.

Strengthening School Accountability

Once schools and communities have in place challenging academic standards and assessments that measure student performance against those standards, they can improve their school accountability systems and target assistance to help schools improve academic achievement. States, school districts, and schools can develop more accurate and useful information for the public regarding school performance. They can also more effectively develop rewards for high-performing schools and intervene in those that are low-performing, as Maryland and Kentucky are doing as part of their overall reform efforts. Furthermore, when states have a system for holding schools accountable for student achievement, they can provide additional flexibility to schools to innovate and remove barriers to student learning.

Already some states are promoting greater school accountability as part of their Goals 2000 efforts. For example:

- Based on performance on 4th- and 9th-grade proficiency tests, **Ohio** has identified 127 districts for targeted assistance. These districts will receive Goals 2000 grants to help improve student achievement. Each district has made a public commitment to challenging performance standards, including 75 percent of their students passing all sections of the Ninth Grade Proficiency Test by the end of the 9th grade. An Ohio Department of Education liaison works closely with each district as a broker of services and a "critical friend" to help them think through improvement strategies and link communities with other districts and service providers.

- **New Mexico** has built its Goals 2000 plan around its new accountability system. Every community and school is now required to develop its own education improvement plan, with widespread community input, that is tied to challenging academic standards. Every year schools and districts report student achievement in relation to community goals. State accreditation is being completely redesigned to reflect accountability for community-defined learning results rather than compliance with a state-defined checklist of what should be in a school.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Goals 2000 reform efforts are vastly different because they're controlled by us, they're controlled by the people, not by the top-down sorts of things that we've had in the past. ... I don't recall ever having a national focus like the current Goals 2000 national focus. And I believe that this is going to succeed because one of the greatest things a government can do for its people is to give them hope, and to give them a vision, and that is what these Goals do.

-- Anne Jolly, Teacher, Mobile, Alabama[13]

Goals 2000 funding was used to get our grassroots folk involved in the education process. Fishermen and university presidents sat down at the same table and talked about what needs to happen for our students to be successful.

--Elaine Griffin, Alaska Teacher, National Teacher of the Year, 1995[14]

Supporting improvements in schools and classrooms is the ultimate focus of Goals 2000. Through Goals 2000, schools receive support to increase student learning through competitive subgrants from the state to districts that promote **locally developed** improvement strategies and innovations to help students reach high standards. The bulk of Goals 2000 funds -- 90 percent after the first year -- goes directly from the state to local schools and districts. By awarding funds on a competitive basis, states can place priorities on the awards and target funds to start up or accelerate local improvement initiatives.

Most states have awarded at least one round of grants to districts. Although funds are just now being used by schools, early results are positive. Relatively small grants are triggering significant reforms by giving schools funds for planning and training to focus all activities on raising academic achievement. Often, the toughest money for districts to find is for local reform efforts. Thus local interest in Goals 2000 funding has been overwhelming: local requests to states exceeded first-year funds by as much as 200 to 600 percent depending on the state.

In its first two years, Goals 2000 has provided critical resources for a wide range of school improvement efforts to raise academic achievement, including:

- building new local partnerships among schools, parents, businesses, colleges, and communities to improve education;
- upgrading teacher skills, student assessments, curriculum, and instruction to help schools prepare all students to meet challenging standards; and
- getting educational technology into schools to help students reach high standards.

Activity under Goals 2000 is just beginning, but entire schools and communities are mobilizing to improve the futures of their children by designing coherent, common sense approaches to teaching and learning.

Building New Local Partnerships Among Schools, Parents, Businesses, Colleges and Communities To Improve Education.

Schools alone cannot improve student learning. Families are critical as children's first and primary educators and need to be involved in all aspects of their education. Businesses offer real-world learning experiences, leadership, and resources to improve student learning and school efficiency. And community organizations offer services to ensure that students enter school buildings ready to learn and continue learning after school hours.

Goals 2000 encourages schools to reach out to the broader community to involve parents, families, businesses, and community members in school improvement activities. As school planning committees are using Goals 2000 funds to design and implement strategies to improve teaching and learning, early indications show broader community involvement in schools. Examples from the states show how.

- **Kansas** has established content standards that all children in the state are expected to reach. To attain those goals in Wichita, the schools, higher education, and community members are working together to improve staff development in the Wichita Public Schools. The Horace Mann, Irving, and Park Foreign Languages Magnet school in Wichita is the site of a professional development school that is being run collaboratively by several members of the community, including school staff, students, teacher education faculty, preservice education students, social service agency and business representatives, parents, and neighborhood residents. This $20,000 grant supports efforts to recruit school staff and design staff development programs that give teachers the skills they need to help all students reach the state's standards that were launched with the state's Quality Performance Accreditation Initiative.

- A consortium of districts in northern **Iowa** is using a $65,628 Goals 2000 grant to collaboratively improve student achievement, engage and prepare all school personnel in school improvement, and increase family involvement in learning. The districts are pooling their knowledge by sharing successful strategies and lessons they have learned. Each district is also going to its community to develop a comprehensive school improvement plan. Community needs now drive resource decisions so that local, state, federal, and private resources can more effectively support student learning.

- **North Dakota** awarded a $15,340 grant to Walsh and Pembina Counties for comprehensive school improvement activities. School staff contacted religious leaders, business people, civic leaders, families, and community members who traditionally had not been involved in education. They formed a local planning panel made up of 70 citizens, including teachers, counselors, administrators, family members, civic leaders, and employers. The panel met intensively for a year and designed a four-year plan to improve student learning which included strategies, action steps, timelines, and clear responsibilities for working towards the National Education Goals.

The Community Is Key at Slidell High School in Louisiana

Joe Buccaran, principal of Slidell High School and currently Louisiana's state principal of the year, describes how Goals 2000 helped energize his school:

"Goals 2000 provided the stimulus for us to roll up our sleeves and look deep into our school to find what we needed to do. We asked for a lot of community input for school improvement. ... It's remarkable how Goals 2000 opened the door to so many things. It's about examining your school and its students and determining what needs to be done.

"First, we agreed on what we wanted for our school and our students. Next, we thought about what stood in the way of achieving higher standards of learning and -- as one student said -- 'skills to pay the bills.' We knew one problem was the school's isolation from homes and businesses. So we devised an action plan that involved parents and business. We knew we had to open our doors to the community, and now we have people beating those doors down to get involved. I've been in education for 33 years. For the first time, we all wound up on the same page."

The Goals 2000 committee set priorities for teaching and learning and proposed ways to reach them. Their initiatives include a partnership with local employers that ensures community involvement and helps students identify career goals early on; ongoing, teacher-initiated professional development to keep teachers' skills and knowledge up-to-date; "Tiger Families" that foster a sense of community by pairing students with teachers throughout students' high school years; and highlighting the school's successes.

Bringing together the many partners that influence children's learning is an essential component of improving education. Parents, community members, and business leaders bring valuable resources to teachers and school staff, often providing the extra support that they need to help all students reach high academic standards.

Upgrading Teacher Preparation, Assessments, Curriculum, and Instruction To Help Schools Prepare All Students To Meet Challenging Standards.

As standards are raised, teachers need training to update their knowledge base and utilize state-of-the-art instructional techniques. Assessments must be developed that accurately measure student performance against the tougher standards. Similarly, curricular materials need to be upgraded to reflect higher expectations. It is essential that administrators learn how to create a school environment that focuses on learning and fosters effective practices for reaching all students.

Most states and school districts view teacher preparation, certification, and ongoing professional development as critical for putting their reform strategies into action, but it is often difficult to secure funding for sustained, quality teacher improvement efforts. Hence most states are using much of their first year Goals 2000 funds for local teacher preservice and inservice professional development activities. Descriptions of some examples of these local effort follow.

- In **Connecticut**, the Region 15 Public Schools put together a consortium of nine school districts including urban, suburban, and rural districts in conjunction with a partnership with several colleges, universities, and professional organizations. This consortium received $23,000 to improve student performance through a collaboration of teachers and administrators who together addressed questions around standards, assessments, and follow-up actions to improve student performance. Samples of students' work were brought to the table for discussion. The grant supported inter-school visits and the exchange of instructional materials and assessment strategies. Two districts in the consortium now use electronic mail to communicate and share information within and across districts. Strong links were forged between members of the consortium during the first year of the grant. As one teacher described, "...it has contributed to our standards setting...when we have the opportunity to see what other students are producing, we see that our students' work we once considered 'best' can be improved."

> *"Goals 2000 monies provided funding for staff development that allows me to make learning more meaningful with hands-on activities. My students are becoming better 'thinkers.' Thus, they are developing self-confidence and an enjoyment for learning."*
> *– Sharon Johnson, Teacher, Texarkana, Texas*
> *1995 National Teachers' Forum, Washington, DC*

- **Maine** has used Goals 2000 funds to develop challenging academic standards. More than 300 teachers have gathered together twice in the last year to translate the standards into action. A $15,000 Goals 2000 grant to the Oxford Hills District is supporting the development of model instructional strategies and assessment techniques at its new Oxford Hills Comprehensive High School (OHCHS). At OHCHS, a combination of the area's high schools and technical schools, faculty are creating a new curriculum and a new academic environment so that all students can reach the state's challenging academic standards.

- In **Massachusetts**, the Fitchburg Public Schools -- in collaboration with the Leominster and Lunenburg Public Schools, and Fitchburg State College -- are using $150,000 (over three years) to build the capacity of current and prospective teachers and administrators to implement the Massachusetts Educational Reform Act of 1993. A team of K-12 teachers from all three districts is organizing professional development activities that support district education reform goals related to the state Act. Teachers and administrators are getting hands-on training in problem solving, interdisciplinary teaching, and assessment strategies at the Mathematics and Science Learning Lab and at Fitchburg State College's Professional Development Center. They are using this training to develop a curriculum that supports the state's new curriculum frameworks for math, science, and technology. Technology workshops are also being offered to parents and community members.

- In **Arkansas** the preservice teacher education and licensure program is being completely restructured at the University of Arkansas at Monticello. Teacher education programs are a critical part of preparing teachers to help all students reach the state's academic standards. A collaboration of nine partner school districts in

southeast Arkansas and the University received a $50,000 grant to establish "laboratories" in the partner schools through which prospective teachers learn about effective teaching from master teachers, students, and parents. The University is changing its curriculum and its admissions policies, as well as developing an induction program as a result of this process.

Urban and Rural Local Reform Initiative Grants

Many urban and rural communities that have high concentrations of poor and/or limited English proficient students have high dropout rates and low levels of student achievement. While problems in these schools are severe, they can be overcome through higher expectations, better instructional opportunities, and greater community and parent involvement and collaboration to address diverse student needs. To develop model approaches, five urban and five rural districts received competitive grants directly from the Department using $2.1 million of first-year Goals 2000 national leadership funds. (See Appendix C.)

- The Chicago Public Schools received $605,903 to help all students reach Illinois' academic standards in the Illinois State School Quality Initiative. Through this project, Chicago plans to have a minimum of 100 schools develop and implement school improvement plans -- with the involvement of teachers, parents, and community members -- that are responsive to the educational needs of limited English proficient and economically disadvantaged students. Over the course of four years, Chicago intends to: increase the high school graduation rate to 80 percent; raise the student daily attendance rate; increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards in core subjects; and increase the percentage of graduates employed or engaged in advanced training or higher education a year after graduation to 90 percent.

- The Box Elder Public Schools and the Heart Butte District #1 in Montana each received grants -- totalling $84,308 and $69,369 respectively -- to raise student achievement. Both districts mainly serve Native American students, more than half of whom are limited English proficient and/or economically disadvantaged. Community-wide panels are developing strategies for schoolwide reform and measures to track progress of their reform initiatives. They are also refocusing their curriculum and developing various model assessments tied to challenging standards in ten subject areas to meet Montana's goals for student learning.

As these examples illustrate, schools become more effective when challenging standards, curriculum, teacher training, and assessments reinforce one another. Not only will teachers and students know where they are going, but they will be given the vehicles to get there.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Getting Educational Technology Into Schools To Improve Teaching and Learning.

Technology is another important tool that schools are utilizing to accelerate learning. Educational technology provides an ever-expanding horizon of learning opportunities for children and adults alike. It can be a powerful mechanism for demonstrating academic concepts, developing skills, and engaging students in learning basic and advanced academic concepts. Technology can be used to raise the mastery level of students with special needs, such as those with disabilities or limited English proficiency. It can also be used to tailor lessons, thus motivating students who have not traditionally enjoyed learning while also challenging others, including gifted and talented students. Furthermore, technology can increase communication among teachers, parents, schools, and communities, as well as improve efficiency so that schools can focus maximum resources on teaching and learning. Many local Goals 2000 grants include a technology component to help students reach high standards.

- The Gresham-Barlow School District in **Oregon** is focusing its $50,000 grant on helping teachers use technology to teach students the high academic standards reflected in the state's Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) requirements. Each of the district's 17 schools identified two teachers new to using technology as part of their lessons. Faculty at Portland State University helped these teachers learn how to evaluate their teaching strategies within their own classrooms. Then teachers attended a series of workshops on integrating technology with instruction. Now they are designing at least one unit tied to a CIM proficiency that uses technology extensively. The teachers will monitor how well their students meet CIM requirements and modify their strategies accordingly.

- Schools in Springfield, **Illinois** see technology as one tool for helping students reach high standards. The Springfield School District 186 is using $158,471 in Goals 2000 funds to provide teams from 15 schools, each made up of four teachers and administrators, with six weeks of intensive training in Project Lincoln, the district's own approach to using technology throughout the curriculum. Participants spend approximately half of their time working in school teams to develop new curriculum units that utilize technology and schoolwide plans to improve student learning.

- The West Iron County Public Schools in **Michigan** are using Goals 2000 funds to integrate the use of technology into their lessons. The Computers as Tools (CATS) professional development program trains teachers to cooperate in team teaching and thematic instruction and to actively utilize interactive multimedia and computer-assisted instruction.

Developing Statewide Strategies to Expand the Use of Educational Technology

In the first year of Goals 2000 each participating state received a supplementary grant of at least $75,000 to develop, as part of its overall education improvement plan, strategies for the use of educational technology in schools. In some cases the Goals 2000 technology planning grant has been a catalyst for states to think about statewide technology strategies for the first time; in others, the grant helped update existing plans.

One example of how technology has been incorporated into a state reform effort is **Utah**, where the state's Goals 2000 technology award was used to further implement the state's Educational Technology Initiative (ETI). A recent evaluation of the ETI indicates that it has had a positive impact on education at all levels as it has become entwined with the state's efforts to raise student achievement levels.

So far state plans have included such strategies as using technology as a tool for teaching academic content and using technology to make accommodations and adaptations in instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities. Some states are using technology to broadcast courses, thus bringing lessons from other places into local classrooms. States are also developing communication networks -- using electronic mail and the Internet -- for teachers and administrators to share information, successful strategies, and lessons learned from local and state programs. In addition, technology is an essential tool for tracking school progress and holding schools accountable for student achievement.

The many examples in this section highlight the variety of ways that schools and communities are improving education. Increasing numbers of citizens are investing their energy and resources into helping all children learn at high levels. Given a focus on high standards, strong parent and community involvement, and flexibility for innovation, schools can make vast improvements. Goals 2000 is adding momentum to such locally driven, standards-based school improvement activity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLEXIBILITY FOR IMPROVEMENT: A BETTER FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP WITH STATES AND COMMUNITIES

Over the last two years, the Congress and the United States Department of Education have made tremendous progress in transforming the federal relationship with the states on education. It has changed from one based on regulatory compliance to one based on accountability and performance. The change in federal-state partnerships in education has been more than with any other federal service. These important reforms, especially as provided through the Goals 2000 Act, the School-to-Work Act, and the Improving America's Schools Act, have established the right framework for the federal government to support Massachusetts and our local districts in implementing our state's Education Reform Act.

-- Robert V. Antonucci, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education[15]

Just as Oregon's school improvement law changed the relationship between the Oregon Department of Education and local school districts, Goals 2000 is changing the relationship we have with the U.S. Department of Education. Federal officials do not tell us what to do but do offer assistance so we can achieve our goals.

-- Norma Paulus, Oregon State Superintendent of Public Instruction[16]

The U.S. Department of Education strongly supports the central role of communities and states in education, and also recognizes the national interest in supporting school improvement across America. Over the past two years, the Department has worked to provide funding and assistance to states and local districts in ways that maximize flexibility and minimize paperwork. It is operating in new ways that rely on a commitment to a shared goal -- improvements in teaching and learning -- by focusing on results, fostering state collaboration, and promoting flexibility.

A Better Way of Doing Business.

The U.S. Department of Education is now working in partnership with states and localities by emphasizing educational results instead of paperwork and rules. Goals 2000 helps the U.S. Department of Education support and assist states and communities in their efforts to improve education for all students. Hence, ***no regulations have been issued for the implementation of Goals 2000.***

Applications for Goals 2000 funding have been straightforward and simple -- ***only 4 pages in the first year.*** States simply describe how they will develop and implement a comprehensive state improvement plan and award subgrants to local districts. The application review has also been streamlined so that the ***review, approval, and the obligation of funds generally takes less than three weeks*** from the receipt of the application.

Similarly, the format and content of comprehensive state improvement plans submitted under Goals 2000 are left to states. Goals 2000 plans are ***state*** plans for improving their education systems; they are more than applications for federal funding. As such they come in a variety of forms.

Recognizing that successful reform is an ongoing process and that states are at different points along the continuum, the Department has designed a review process for state plans that provides helpful feedback to states from peers who have knowledge and expertise about education improvement. Guidance for the review of plans was developed with the input of state and local leaders across the country. Incorporating the general plan requirements, the guidance offers questions to consider while examining whether a given plan meets three criteria: 1) reasonable promise of helping all students reach high standards; 2) widespread commitment to the plan throughout the state; and 3) local flexibility for innovation. Reviewers are instructed to read the plan with the needs of the individual states as the focus.

The process for reviewing state plans has provided a constructive opportunity for states to learn from the experience of other states and communities and receive help. Review of plans is conducted by a panel of five peer reviewers from outside the federal government, with a wide range of experience and expertise including teachers, parents, business leaders, superintendents, experts on teaching students who are learning English as a second language, special education experts, policy-makers, state leaders, and others from across the country. The peer reviewers analyze each plan and then visit the state to engage in extensive discussions and share ideas before making a recommendation regarding approval. More important, these reviewers provide states with expert advice on how to overcome challenges and point out areas that need additional attention. The purpose of the review is to help states, not pick "winners and losers." States have consistently observed that the conversation with and input from the peer reviewers is a new and more effective approach to partnership with the U.S. Department of Education. They have often noted the value added by the fresh perspectives of outside peers who generally stimulate dialogue among state and local stakeholders that continues well beyond the peer review.

A New Approach to Program Management.

Making these changes has required new types of leadership in the U.S. Department of Education. The Goals 2000 initiative is not a program per se, but a framework within which other Department programs fit, particularly those that serve elementary and secondary students. Rather than simply creating a separate Goals 2000 program office or assigning specific sections of the Act to certain offices, the Secretary established a Management Council, composed of leaders and senior advisers across the Department. The interaction and coordination across offices from the outset has allowed the offices to work together as partners to better serve states, localities, and schools. For instance, collaborative work across offices has helped the Department better coordinate and integrate the provision of technical assistance, including services provided through its research laboratories and comprehensive technical assistance centers.

Increasing Flexibility Through Waivers from Federal Requirements.

The Department also supports state efforts by offering waivers from federal requirements that may impede school improvement. The Goals 2000 Act, the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act all recognize that states

and communities moving forward with effective reforms geared to higher academic standards may occasionally encounter barriers posed by the requirements of federal programs. In response, these Acts for the first time authorize the Secretary to waive the majority of statutory and regulatory requirements for the Department's elementary and secondary education and vocational education programs, if necessary, to clear the way for better teaching and learning.

In order to carry out the Goals 2000 waiver authority and other waiver authorities, the Department of Education has created a Waiver Action Board. The Waiver Board, which is composed of senior officers from across the Department, is charged with reviewing and making recommendations on applications for waivers. The Board helps to ensure that waiver requests across program areas are handled in a consistent and expeditious manner.

The Department has sent information about the new possibilities provided by waivers and other new features in federal education programs to all school districts. It has also posted waiver information on the Internet, established a Waiver Assistance Line to aid potential applicants, and briefed state and local officials about waivers at all regional and national meetings on K-12 school reform.

Thus far, the Department has approved more than 100 waivers under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act waiver authority. These waivers have covered requirements of programs such as Title I (the most common), Eisenhower Professional Development state grants, the ESEA Charter Schools program, and the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education program, in some cases to carry out local school improvement plans developed under Goals 2000.

States are eligible for waivers under the Goals 2000 waiver authority after they have a completed state improvement plan. To date, one waiver has been sought and approved under the Goals 2000 waiver authority.

- **Oregon** received waivers of some Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act regulations in August 1995 as part of its comprehensive school improvement efforts. These waivers allow consortia of school districts and community colleges, based on Oregon's workforce development regions, to receive federal funds under Title II-C of the Perkins Act. The waivers also enable small community colleges to participate in the program by allowing all institutions in a consortium to contribute to the $50,000 minimal allotment the legislation requires postsecondary institutions to generate in order for a consortium to receive a grant. The consortium will use the Perkins funds to provide high quality vocational education programs to both high school and postsecondary students.

With a growing number of completed Goals 2000 state improvement plans, an increasing number of states will likely apply for waivers under the Goals 2000 waiver authority. A Federal Register notice is published periodically that lists all waivers that the Department has issued. To date, no waivers have been terminated under any of the Department's waiver authorities.

Many actual and potential waiver applicants have been able to move ahead with their school reform plans, after consultation with the Department, without needing a waiver. This underscores the considerable flexibility that already exists in the Department's programs, but also has led the Department to continually review and clarify its guidance documents to make sure that program requirements are made as clear as possible.

Maximizing Flexibility Through the Ed-Flex Demonstration Program.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of the Department's new flexibility is the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration initiative (Ed-Flex) established by the Goals 2000 Act. Under Ed-Flex, the Secretary is able to delegate to six state education agencies the authority to waive certain federal statutory or regulatory requirements for states, districts, or schools, in order to remove barriers to better teaching and learning. Under Ed-Flex, in exchange for agreeing to greater accountability for results, the state is given the authority to make determinations on federal waivers for itself and its school districts, rather than submitting waiver requests to the Secretary. On February 17, 1995, Oregon was the first state designated to participate in the demonstration. Five others were designated subsequently.

ED-Flex Demonstration States:

Kansas	**Oregon**
Massachusetts	**Texas**
Ohio	**Vermont**

Ed-Flex states have an approved state education improvement plan under Goals 2000. In addition, the state needs to agree to provide appropriate waivers to local districts and schools. Those seeking waivers agreed to be held accountable for the academic performance of their students. Under Ed-Flex, a state may waive requirements relating to several programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, as well as certain requirements of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) and the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) applicable to the covered programs. However, requirements pertaining to health and safety, civil rights, parental participation and certain other provisions **may not** be waived. Moreover, before granting a waiver, a state must first determine that the underlying purposes of the affected program will continue to be met.

Of the participating states, three (Massachusetts, Oregon, and Kansas) have sought and received authority only to waive requirements when asked by individual school districts. The other states have the additional authority to waive requirements on a statewide basis, if necessary to remove barriers to helping children learn better. Thus far, three states (Kansas, Massachusetts, and Oregon) have already begun approving waivers, and all participating states are making progress in implementing their new authority to waive federal program requirements.

CONCLUSION

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With Goals 2000, we are out of the block and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the states and hundreds of communities.
-- Richard W. Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education[17]

Throughout the U.S., states and communities are leading the way to make higher academic standards a reality for every child. They are also developing assessments that measure student performance against their new standards and designing accountability systems that take student performance into account. As demonstrated throughout this report, Goals 2000 funds are providing significant support for these efforts.

While challenging standards and rigorous assessments are developed and put into place, simultaneous improvements are underway in the areas of professional development and teacher preparation so that teachers are equipped to teach to challenging standards. Curricula and instruction are being upgraded and technology brought into classrooms. These changes are being designed and implemented with the active involvement of educators, community members, business leaders, and policy-makers throughout states and communities.

While Goals 2000 has had a significant impact on the progress of school reform at state and local levels, numerous challenges remain. Helping all districts engage in comprehensive reform to bring every child to high levels of academic achievement is no easy task. Challenging academic standards will need to be clear and understandable for all school districts. Similarly, the development of new assessments that measure the performance of every child against high standards presents its own set of costs and complexities to adequately assess all students, including those who may need testing accommodations, such as those with disabilities or limited English proficiency. States and districts will need to make better use of all of their resources, including federal funds, to improve every school.

The kind of grassroots education reform that Goals 2000 supports will take a long-term commitment and sustained effort. The purpose of Goals 2000 is to stimulate real action, real change and real involvement in teaching and learning. It is not just a planning exercise, although the reform it envisions is based on solid planning. Once state and local strategies are developed they need to be implemented so that each strategy reinforces and supports the others. Change of this magnitude -- in some 80,000 public schools in some 15,000 school districts -- requires sustained commitment.

In order to succeed, states and school districts also need assurance that federal support for their reform efforts will continue. The recent National Education Summit involving the governors, business leaders, and the President gave renewed strength to calls for school improvements that include challenging academic standards, better school accountability, and more widespread access to learning tools such as educational technology. Goals 2000 can be a source of support for this effort by states and local communities. The achievement gains in states such as Maryland and Kentucky show that sustained comprehensive reform based on high academic standards works.

Despite the considerable challenges the nation, states, and communities face in the quest to raise student achievement and get our children on the right course, there are many promising activities under way, and Goals 2000 is helping accelerate this progress. Schools, districts, and states are using their funds strategically to build upon ongoing improvement efforts. Goals 2000 promotes the development and ownership of standards, assessment, and other aspects of education improvement at the **local and state levels**. It promotes effective innovations in a climate and spirit of self-determination by those in the states and school districts with federal support and assistance. Goals 2000 helps ensure that students complete school not only learning the basics, but with the skills and knowledge needed to succeed in today's world. Teachers, parents, business leaders, and community members across the country have made their expectations clear: every child needs to reach higher standards. The future of our democracy and economy depend on it.

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *High School Transcript Study, 1982, 1987, 1990, and 1994.* National Education Longitudinal Study Transcripts, 1992.

2. The College Board, *AP Program: National Summary*, various years, and U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1995.* Calculations by Weststat: December 1995.

3. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *NAEP 1992 Trends in Academic Progress: Achievement of U.S. Students in Science, 1969 to 1992; Mathematics, 1973 to 1992; Reading, 1971 to 1992; and Writing, 1984 to 1992.* Washington, D.C.: July 1994.

4. The College Board, *College Bound Seniors.* New York: various years. Calculations by Weststat: February 1996.

5. Kentucky Department of Education, *Student Academic Achievement Continues to Rise.* Frankfort, KY: Press Release, January 30, 1996.

6. Maryland State Department of Education, *High Expectations Producing Better Schools, State School Superintendent Grasmick Says.* Baltimore, MD: Press Release, December 12, 1995.

7. William T. Randall, Commissioner of Education in Colorado and President, Council of Chief State School Officers, *What Works in Public Schools.* Hearing before the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: January 31, 1996.

8. Governor Tommy G. Thompson, letter to Michael Cohen, Senior Advisor to Secretary Richard Riley, September 18, 1995.

9. Adapted from David L. Stevenson, U.S. Department of Education, "Goals 2000 and Local Reform," *Teachers College Record* Volume 96, Number 3. Columbia University: Spring 1995.

10. Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll 1995, *Phi Delta Kappan,* Volume 77, Number 1. September 1995, page 47.

11. Adapted from Anderson, Leslie, Leila Fiester, Miriam Gonzales, and Ellen Pechman, eds., *Improving America's Schools: A Newsletter on Issues in School Reform,* Working Document. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Spring 1996, pp. 1-2.

12. Adapted from the Massachusetts Department of Education, *Math Curriculum Framework: Achieving Mathematical Power.* Boston, MA: October 1995 Draft.

13. Anne Jolly, Teacher in Mobile, Alabama, 1995 Teacher Focus Group.

14. Elaine Griffin, Current National Teacher of the Year, 1995 National Teachers' Forum, Washington, D.C.: November 1995.

15. Robert V. Antonucci, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education, *The Federal Role in Education Reform.* Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: June 21, 1995.

16. Norma Paulus, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Oregon. Written Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: June 21, 1995.

17. Richard W. Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education, *The Goals 2000: Educate America Act.* Testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education and Related Agencies. Washington, D.C.: September 12, 1995.

APPENDIX A
GOALS 2000 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

STATE	FY 1994 FUNDING	FY 1995 FUNDING	1996 ESTIMATES
TOTAL (52 STATES)	91,480,000	358,251,300	340,000,000
ALABAMA	1,601,966	5,941,766*	5,681,050
ALASKA	459,903	1,547,345	1,438,578
ARIZONA	1,362,358	5,450,582	5,043,051
ARKANSAS	991,579	3,650,495	3,437,883
CALIFORNIA	10,524,929	42,111,705	39,246,198
COLORADO	1,085,028	4,288,514	3,926,124
CONNECTICUT	960,721	3,460,756	3,152,404
DELAWARE	405,701	1,291,544	1,244,037
FLORIDA	4,026,309	15,861,034	14,726,761
GEORGIA	2,360,624	8,959,402*	8,522,610
HAWAII	417,148	1,381,641	1,308,835
IDAHO	457,565	1,568,397*	1,479,494
ILLINOIS	4,142,656	15,992,571	15,064,252
INDIANA	1 ,734,498	6,557,145*	6,286,497
IOWA	886,746	3,219,618	3,080,623
KANSAS	864,615	3,193,916	3,102,386
KENTUCKY	1,477,200	5,775,274	5,554,441
LOUISIANA	2,066,082	7,968,128	7,648,916
MAINE	505,866	1,647,540	1,536,773
MARYLAND	1,448,309	5,379,938	5,020,587
MASSACHUSETTS	1,881,814	6,990,859	6,248,029
MICHIGAN	3,626,515	14,371,488	13,665,726
MINNESOTA	1,387,624	5,377,078	5,066,607
MISSISSIPPI	1,359,516	5,094,972	4,869,221
MISSOURI	1,691,269	6,525,935	6,137,543
MONTANA	449,712	1,560,150*	1,461,217
NEBRASKA	567,422	1,986,104*	1,835,986
NEVADA	410,095	1,419,052	1,304,204
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	1,290,294*	1,233,712
NEW JERSEY	2,447,997	8,792,536	7,911,220
NEW MEXICO	741,603	2,782,261	2,612,568
NEW YORK	7,173,261	27,112,295	25,380,949
NORTH CAROLINA	2,062,239	7,745,087	7,286,808
NORTH DAKOTA	406,274	1,340,576	1,261,108
OHIO	3,715,308	14,833,684	14,239,564
OKLAHOMA	1,153,998	4,396,613*	4,180,457
OREGON	1,046,640	4,012,392	3,803,352
PENNSYLVANIA	4,074,763	15,529,194	14,477,350
RHODE ISLAND	442,261	1,480,004	1,360,881
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,274,631	4,710,359	4,515,649
SOUTH DAKOTA	426,975	1,412,549*	1,311,086
TENNESSEE	1,677,460	6,387,802	6,004,805
TEXAS	7,293,999	29,228,278	27,211,732
UTAH	709,092	2,587,039	2,455,146
VERMONT	406,722	1,272,847	1,226,836
VIRGINIA	0	6,658,924*	6,205,836
WASHINGTON	1,581,128	6,328,974	6,062,349
WEST VIRGINIA	778,396	2,799,259	2,790,910
WISCONSIN	1,682,771	6,582,097	6,325,815
WYOMING	370,124	1,262,907*	1,225,242
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	476,600	1,523,409	1,354,425
PUERTO RICO	2,383,988	9,608,968	9,072,164
BIA	536,222	2,199,558	
OUTLYING AREAS, BIA AND ALASKA NATIVES			3,400,000

* have not yet applied for second year funding

APPENDIX B

COMPLETED STATE IMPROVEMENT PLANS

STATE	PLAN REVIEW COMPLETED
Colorado	April 22, 1996
Delaware	October 23, 1995
Iowa	April 12, 1996
Kansas	August 22, 1995
Kentucky	March 13, 1995
Maryland	September 29, 1995
Massachusetts	May 16, 1995
Michigan	August 25, 1995
Minnesota	March 19, 1995
Missouri	Under Review
Nevada	November 10, 1995
New Mexico	October 3, 1995
North Dakota	September 29, 1995
Ohio	July 18, 1995
Oregon	January 26, 1995
Texas	October 3, 1995
Utah	April 10, 1995
Vermont	September 6, 1995
Washington	Under Review
West Virginia	February 13, 1996
Bureau of Indian Affairs	October 3, 1995

APPENDIX C

URBAN AND RURAL REFORM GRANTS

SCHOOL DISTRICT	AWARD
Urban Reform Grants:	
Chicago Public Schools, Illinois	$605,093
New York City Community School District 4, New York	$240,038
Jersey City Public Schools, New Jersey	$200,965
Wayne County Schools, Michigan	$171,399
Yonkers City School District, New York	$325,221
Rural Reform Grants:	
Box Elder Public Schools, Montana	$69,369
Chugach School District, Anchorage, Alaska	$226,881
Cobre Consolidated Schools, New Mexico	$171,237
Heart Butte Public Schools, Montana	$84,308
Todd County School District, North Dakota	$171,399

APPENDIX D

GOALS 2000 PARENTAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

Research and practice have shown that parent involvement in education is a critical factor for raising student achievement. Title IV of the Goals 2000 Act provides $10 million in grants to local non-profit organizations to work collaboratively with schools and other organizations to increase parental involvement in their children's learning. Goals 2000 has funded 28 Parental Assistance Centers nationwide through a highly competitive process. Each center serves an entire state or a region within a state, and targets both urban and rural areas that have large concentrations of low income, minority, or limited English proficient parents, though services and information are offered to all interested parents.

Parent Assistance Centers -- in collaboration with schools, school districts, social service agencies, and other nonprofit groups -- are working to increase parents' knowledge of and confidence in child-rearing activities, strengthen partnerships between parents and professionals in meeting the educational needs of children from birth through graduation, and enhance the developmental progress of the children assisted under the program. They have each designed their outreach strategies and services to emphasize local priorities and conditions. They encompass a rich variety of practices including parent-to-parent training activities, hotlines, mobile training teams, lending libraries, support groups, and referral networks. All of the centers also must provide support to preschool children through either the Parents As Teachers (PAT) or Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) programs, both widely replicated, home-based models that have proven to be highly effective in helping parents prepare their children for school success. For example:

- The Missouri Partnership for Parenting Assistance is a collaborative effort to provide parenting education and assistance throughout Missouri. The project provides training to parents with children from birth through high school. It also expands literacy services to low income families. Furthermore, the center is expanding parent access to services, materials, and resources through statewide dissemination of information and policy coordination among education, social services, and other resource providers.

- The CONNECTIONS parent center in Geneseo, New York, is sponsored by the Geneseo Migrant Center. The center's main goal is to assist migrant farmworker parents in developing the skills they need in order to aid in their children's educational development. To meet client needs, the center has implemented flexible hours to improve parent access to trained staff members. In addition, the center places educators in migrant camps to instruct adults in English as a Second Language (ESL), and brings a computer-equipped van to sites where parents might be gathered.

By working at a state or regional level, parent assistance centers are expanding statewide information and support networks to better assist parents in their efforts to help their children learn. The diverse needs of each state are reflected in the wide variety of services provided by the parental assistance centers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D (cont.)
GOALS 2000 PARENTAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

Grantee	State	Grant Amount
Ahmium Education, Inc.	California	$ 339,104
Clayton Foundation	Colorado	$ 449,000
Greater Washington Urban League	DC	$ 264,712
Center for Excellence	Florida	$ 495,179
Albany/Dougherty 2000 Partnership for Education	Georgia	$ 265,566
Parents and Children Together	Hawaii	$ 389,697
The Higher Plain, Inc.	Iowa	$ 328,191
Licking Valley Community Action Program	Kentucky	$ 309,546
Maine Parent Federation, Inc.	Maine	$ 125,000
Child Care Connection, Inc.	Maryland	$ 470,401
Cambridge Partnership for Public Education	Massachusetts	$ 364,379
Life Services of Ottowa County, Inc.	Michigan	$ 209,090
PACER Center, Inc.	Minnesota	$ 324,000
Literacy Investment for Tomorrow-(LIFT)	Missouri	$ 453,472
Sunrise Children's Hospital Foundation	Nevada	$ 212,703
Parent Information Center	New Hampshire	$ 289,034
Prevent Child Abuse-New Jersey	New Jersey	$ 358,304
Geneseo Migrant Center, Inc.	New York	$ 249,952
Exceptional Children's Assistance Center	North Carolina	$ 367,783
Lighthouse Youth Services, Inc.	Ohio	$ 388,621
Parents as Partners in Education	Oklahoma	$ 377,247
Community Action Southwest	Pennsylvania	$ 453,013
Black Hills Special Services Foundation	South Dakota	$ 436,267
NashvilleREAD, Inc.	Tennessee	$ 199,231
Mental Health Association of Texas	Texas	$ 499,941
Vermont Family Resource Partnership	Vermont	$ 388,576
Children's Home Society of Washington	Washington	$ 462,991
United Health Group of Wisconsin	Wisconsin	$ 468,000

APPENDIX E

AMENDMENTS TO THE GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 was enacted on April 26, 1996. It contained several amendments to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The significant changes follow.

- **Additional Ed-Flex states authorized**

  The Secretary is authorized to grant six additional states, whose Goals 2000 plans are approved by the Secretary, Ed-Flex waiver authority. The amendments do not contain the large state/small state breakdown that governed the original ED-Flex designations.

- **Alternative to Secretarial approval of state plans created**

  In lieu of submitting its Goals 2000 state plan, or major amendments to the plan, to the Secretary for review and approval, a state may instead submit --

  (1) an assurance from the Governor and chief state school officer that it has a plan that meets the requirements of the Act and that is widely available throughout the state, and that any amendments will meet these requirements; and

  (2) benchmarks of improved student performance and of progress in implementing the plan, and timelines against which progress may be measured.

  States that choose this alternative submission option are not required to submit Goals 2000 annual reports to the Secretary, but would instead report annually to the public on the use of Goals 2000 funds, and of progress in meeting their benchmarks and timelines.

- **Direct grants to local educational agencies in nonparticipating states authorized**

  Local educational agencies in any state that was not participating in Goals 2000 as of October 20, 1995 may, with the state educational agency's approval, apply directly to the Secretary for a portion of their state's Goals 2000 allotment.

- **Specific panel composition requirements eliminated**

  The specific requirements governing the composition of the Goals 2000 state panels have been eliminated. The amendments merely provide that state plans must be developed by a broad-based state panel in cooperation with the state educational agency and the governor.

- **Permissible use of Goals 2000 funds for technology clarified**

  The amendments clarify that Goals 2000 funds may be used for the acquisition of technology and the use of technology-enhanced curricula and instruction.

- **References to opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies eliminated**

  References to opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, as well as in the Improving America's Schools Act, have been deleted.

- **Provisions authorizing a National Education Standards Improvement Council (NESIC) repealed**

  The amendments repeal the provisions in Goals 2000 that authorized the establishment of NESIC.

- **No mandates for outcomes-based education, school-based health clinics, or social service clarified**

  The amendments expressly state that Goals 2000 may not be construed to require a stat a local educational agency, or a school, as a condition of receiving Goals 2000 assistance --

  (1) to provide outcomes-based education, or
  (2) to provide school-based health clinics or social service.